

Serial No.: 10/672,106

Attorney Docket No.: 2003P08211US

REMARKS

Upon entry of the instant Amendment, Claims 1, 3-14, and 16-20 are pending. Claims 2 and 15 have been canceled. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to more particularly point out Applicants' invention. Claim 17 has been amended to overcome the section 112 rejection. The Specification has been amended to provide serial numbers for related applications. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, 14, 16-17, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Murray, U.S. Patent No. 6,484,033 ("Murray"). In order for there to be anticipation, each and every element of the claimed invention must be present in a single prior reference. Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is not taught, suggested, or implied by Murray.

As described in the Specification, a remote device equipped with an audible alarm and a transmission alarm is provided in accordance with embodiments of the present invention. The alarms can be sounded based upon different boundaries or geographic ranges. In particular, in certain embodiments, an alarm can sound when a device is determined to be outside a predetermined geographic range; the location can be transmitted to an administration device a predetermined period after the alarm has sounded if the device is not returned to within the range.

Thus, claim 1 has been amended to recite "wherein said wireless communications controller is adapted to cause positioning information to be transmitted to an associated administration device when said telecommunications device is determined to be outside said first predetermined geographic range for longer than a predetermined period after said audible alarm has been generated;" claim 9 has been amended to recite "an administrative device for receiving alerts from said wireless communication device via said communications controller when said positioning controller determines that said wireless device is outside said first predetermined geographic range for longer than a predetermined period or is outside said first predetermined geographic range and a second predetermined geographic range and after said audible warning has been generated, but wherein said positioning controller

Serial No.: 10/672,106

Attorney Docket No.: 2003P08211US

does not send an alert if said wireless device returns to said first predetermined geographic range within the predetermined period;" and claim 14 has been amended to recite "generating an audible warning if said wireless device is determined to be outside said first predetermined geographic range; and transmitting one or more alerting signals to an administrative device when said wireless device is determined to be outside said first predetermined geographic range for longer than a predetermined period after said audible warning has been generated."

In contrast, as discussed in response to the previous Official Action, Murray merely relates to a pager system that has a calendar service, rather than a perimeter defining and monitoring service as generally recited in the claims at issue. No alarm is sounded or triggered in Murray in response to crossing a geographic range. In Murray, another user is telephoned if a device is determined not to be able to return to an available conference site in time for the conference.

However, the user in Murray is not able to set first and second geographic ranges (or even one), as generally recited in the claims at issue. Further, a user of Murray is not able to set a range for setting an audible alarm (Claims 1, 9, and 14) and a time (Claims 1, 9, and 14) or second range (Claim 9) for setting a transmission/location alarm, as generally recited in the claims at issue. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 6, 12-13, and 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Murray and various "well known prior art." Murray has been discussed above. Assuming arguendo that such is indeed "well known prior art," applicants note that the alleged "well known prior art" does not remedy the deficiencies of Murray as discussed above. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Serial No.: 10/672,106

Attorney Docket No.: 2003P08211US

For all of the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, which allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully requested,

SIEMENS CORPORATION

By: 

David D. Chung
Registration No.:
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Tel.: 650-694-5339
Fax: 650-968-4517

Date: 6 March 06

SIEMENS CORPORATION
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
ATTENTION: Elsa Keller, Legal Department
Telephone: (732) 321-3026